REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14 were pending in the application. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 5, and 7 have been amended. Claims 16-21 have been added. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, and 16-21 are currently pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection:

Claims 1-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garret, U.S. Patent 6,877,033, in view of Parmar, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0023711. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The cited references, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. Independent claim 1 recites:

A method comprising: <u>generating</u> identification information <u>identifying a network component</u> **connected to a computer network,** the <u>network component having a memory</u> storing a first set of data items relating to the network component, said generating comprising <u>the network component retrieving one or more of said first set of data items from said memory</u> and <u>generating</u> said identification <u>information from said retrieved data items</u>. (Emphasis added).

Independent claim 7 recites, in pertinent part:

A method of <u>operating a computer network</u> including a <u>first network component</u> and <u>a second network component</u> **linked to the first network component by a communication network,** the second network component <u>being operable to perform a network management application</u> wherein a request for identification information <u>identifying the first network component</u> is sent via the communications network to the first network component ... (Emphasis added).

The Examiner continues to contend that Garrett substantially teaches the combinations of features recited in the independent claims, and continues to cite Garrett in, among other places, col. 4, line 4-5, col. 1, and col. 2, lines 52-53. As noted both in the Office Action Response of February 5, 2008, and the Request for Pre-Appeal Review of August 1, 2008, the components referred to by Garrett and cited by the Examiner are components of an **electronic circuit**. Furthermore, these are not even actual electronic components, but rather, information related to or representative of electronic components. Thus, Garrett does not teach or suggest network component having a memory storing a first set of data items" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 7.

In the present office action, the Examiner acknowledges that "Garret et al. does not explicitly mention that the built circuit and the "suggested component" web pages relate to the component of a computer network to the extent of the claimed language." The Examiner then contends that Parmar discloses a policy based network management system to identify one or more policies. In support of this contention, the Examiner cites paragraph [0014] of Parmar, which states the following:

> [0014] Devices also can be grouped together--to form a network device group--based on some common characteristics. By doing so, policies can be associated with a group rather than to individual devices. Devices can be grouped based on device type, physical location, supported capabilities and so on. For example, in a domain, all routers (or switches, load balancers) could belong to one group, all devices in an enterprise's marketing building could be in a separate group, and/or all routers supporting a particular protocol could be in another group. A group can be further broken down into subgroups, for example a group of routers could be split into gateway routers and intranet routers. Likewise, other components can be associated with policies, including usernames, application names, end-host names, and so on. These components can be grouped in the manner similar to that described above to produce groups of users, end-hosts, applications, and so on. As used herein, a "network component" refers to any of a network device (physical or virtual), a user, an application, an end-host, a group of any of the foregoing, or a subgroup of any of the foregoing. (Emphasis added).

Nothing in the above citation provides any teaching or suggestion of ""generating identification information identifying a network component **connected to** a computer network, ...said generating comprising the network component retrieving one or more of said first set of data items from said memory" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 7. In fact, Parmar does not teach retrieving any type of data from memory of a network component or any generation of identification information, by the network component, based thereon. As Garrett fails to teach components related to a computer network, as acknowledged by the Examiner in the office action, it follows that Garrett in view of Parmar fails to teach or suggest "generating identification information identifying a network component **connected to** a computer network ... said generating comprising the network component retrieving one or more of said first set of data items from said memory and generating said identification information from said retrieved data items."

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Garrett in view of Parmar fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. Accordingly, removal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Patentability of the Added Claims:

The present amendment adds claims 16-20. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added, and that claims 16-20 are fully supported in the specification as file (e.g., in original claims 1 and 7, Figs. 1, 2, and 7 and their corresponding descriptions in the specification). Applicant further submits that claims 16-20 are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons given above.

Conclusion:

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505\5681-74800.

Respectfully submitted,

Erik A. Heter
Reg. No. 50,652

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800
Date: March 5, 2008